SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. VII, No. 16 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | October 1, 1977

How R&D Figures in New Energy Department

The Department of Energy (DOE) officially comes into existence today, and for the research and development community, the key man in the $10.4-billion conglomerate is John M. Deutch, 39, who is stepping from the chairmanship of MIT's chemistry department to head DOE's Office of Energy Research.

Deutch's office, at the second level in the multi-layered organizational chart of the sprawling DOE, will be in charge of the Department's basic research activities, as well as a good deal of developmental research. In DOE's own turgid prose:

> Dr. Deutch will advise the Secretary on the physical and energy research and development programs of the Department, the use of multi-purpose laboratories, education and training for basic and applied research activities, and financial assistance for these activities. He will manage the basic sciences program and support certain research and development projects not performed elsewhere. He will advise on budget priorities for research and development projects. He will also chair the Department's R&D Coordination Council, which will ensure that the research and development activities of all program Assistant Secretaries are coordinated.

With the bulk of its budget and program coming by way of inheritance from the old Energy Research and Development Administration, DOE is the latest product of numerous bureaucratic reshuffles aimed at dealing with the energy crisis. That it is the most ambitious and extensive is beyond doubt, nor can there be any question that DOE Secretary James R. Schlesinger is the most formidable figure yet to head up energy activities for the federal government. All in all, Washington gives Schlesinger high marks for the team that he has assembled around him.

Carter's Science Adviser Gives First Big Speech — Page 5

DOE background material, distributed at a press briefing September 13, shows that Deutch and the other high-level appointees are well equipped with training and experience for their jobs.

Deutch, for example, is an Amherst College major in history and economics, holds an MIT bachelor's degree in chemical engineering, and a Ph.D. in physical chemistry from the same institution. Between 1961 and 1965 he was a systems analyst with the Defense Department before moving to MIT. He is on the Defense Science Board and the Army Science Advisory Panel.

Other appointments announced by Schlesinger are:

John F. O'Leary, deputy secretary, formerly administrator of the Federal Energy Administration, which is folded into DOE.

Dale D. Myers, under secretary of energy, formerly corporate vice-president of Rockwell International. Myers "will oversee programs requiring major budget outlays, such as energy research, development and application, associated environmental programs, and defense programs."

Alvin L. Alm, assistant secretary for policy and evaluation. He will be DOE's principal policy planner and also be in charge of ensuring competition in the energy industry.

Robert D. Thorne, assistant secretary for energy tech-

(Continued on Page 2)

In Brief

While the Senate is dismantling the Administration's energy program, doubts are spreading about how much reality is in the keystone of that program — a proposed massive switch from oil and gas to coal in industry and particularly in power production. Atmospheric carbon-dioxide buildup was the first alarm to be raised, but now the General Accounting Office says the Administration has gone overboard in its plans for increasing coal production. Carter's plan calls for a near-doubling, to 1.2 billion tons by 1985; GAO says "it will be very difficult to achieve one billion tons" by that date.

Meanwhile, the newly created Department of Energy is going to burn up $17 million — just in moving expenses. DOE is vacating its offices near Union Station, and is taking over the Defense Department's Forrestal Building, on Washington's downtown mall. The big new Department, however, will hang on to its old ERDA building in Germantown, Md.

Officials of the National Cancer Institute and the American Cancer Society are watching the mails these days with more than usual interest. A review of their joint breast x-ray screening program revealed that at least 58 mastectomies performed on the basis of tumors discovered in the course of screening were later found to be benign. The needless surgery could be the basis for legal action.

. . . National Labs Face More Scrutiny in DOE

(Continued From Page 1)

nology, formerly acting assistant administrator at ERDA for nuclear energy. Thorne will "focus on making new energy technologies available for commercial application as early as possible. He will be responsible for research, development and technology demonstration in all fields of energy. He also will administer the Department's nuclear waste management program. He will serve as the primary Department source of energy technology information."

All the above, as well as yet unnamed assistant secretaries for environment, and for conservation and solar applications will need Senate confirmation.

One who doesn't require confirmation but who observers say bears watching, too, is Michael J. Tashjian, who will be director of procurement and contracts management. He did the same work for ERDA, having been brought there from the Defense Department to put ERDA's chaotic procurement policies into shape. He will be a major figure in the struggle to promote smooth technology transfer between government and industry.

Administering research and development at DOE will require the skills of a Merlin because R&D policies will be closely attuned to technological feasibility, which in turn is heavily influenced by price. Coal gasification, for example, will be under the influence of natural gas prices, which will be dominated by regulatory policies. Never before have government R&D programs been so closely wed to the unpredictable marketpace. It will be a major goal of DOE to bring predictability to a technological situation dependent on the price and the geopolitics of oil.

DOE must also determine feasible technology against the looming threat of carbon dioxide buildup in the atmosphere, caused by the accelerating combustion of fossil fuels. Some scientists, such as Alvin Weinberg of the Institute for Energy Analysis at Oak Ridge, Tenn., feel technological decisions must be made now to cope with possible climatic changes caused by the buildup.

Research and development is expected to be so closely linked to application that the autonomy of the various national laboratories will continue to be threatened. A feeling at the Office of Management and Budget persists, for example, that national lab budgets deserve more scrutiny, that too much money is spent on projects that couldn't be justified if they went the contract route or were subjected to zero-based budgeting.

The working philosophy regarding R&D at DOE will involve the grouping of new technologies by their "evolution in the research, development, and application process rather than by fuel type," says a DOE fact book. "As the major concerns with a project involve bringing it to commercial reality rather than proving technical feasibility," it says in neat conceptual tones, "the project will be reviewed for transfer either to the assistant secretary for resource applications or the assistant secretary for conservation and solar applications who will have specialized expertise in commercialization and energy markets." The rhetoric sounds good but price and politics can easily foul procedures.

ERDA tried but never found the handle on any aspects of technological development. A source at the Office of Management and Budget sizes up ERDA's problems this way:

"ERDA had two major problems. First, it was too much of an R&D organization with insufficient emphasis on getting the technology on line. Second, it was too premature in pushing non-nuclear technology. Too many engineers were in charge and most projects lacked a solid research base. The ten megawatt solar demonstration plant was premature, as well as the coal liquefaction technology.

"ERDA's interface with industry has always been confusing. It is confused over what it should be developing, especially in coal technology. But the problem is tough because ERDA never had enough information on comparative costs of producing gas or petroleum from other sources. Overall, DOE's research will be more problem oriented with emphasis on material properties and engineering data rather than building big pilot plants or small demonstrations. There have been just too many demonstration projects.

"The main problem in commercialization is the right timing, given pricing. The other problem is maximizing

(Continued on Page 3)

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1977

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Contributing Editor
Pamela Moore

European Correspondents
Michael Kenward (London)
Francois Seguier (Paris)

Circulation Manager
Alice Anne Freund

Independently published by *Science & Government Report*, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July and August. Annual Subscription: Institutions, $75 (two years, $140); individuals, $44 (two years, $75). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

NSF Urged to Revamp Information Activities

An extensive reorganization of science information activities at the National Science Foundation is recommended in the final report of a task force appointed last November to conduct an inquiry into NSF's varied activities in information handling.

The task force, chaired by Joe B. Wyatt, vice president for administration at Harvard, was thrust into a field that is already loaded with harsh criticism and warnings concerning the government's unorchestrated information activities. Its findings, however, are harsher than most.

"A quiet revolution, of strategic and international importance to the United States, is occurring in the field of information," the report states. "It is quiet because the signs of change are not always visible. It is a revolution because nothing of comparable significance has happened since the invention of writing and printing. It is destined to dramatically change the way information and knowledge is made available to people all over the world."

The report reviews some of the new technologies that have emerged, along with their use by government agencies, before reciting the problems that have sprung up — uncoordinated data bases, mushrooming costs of libraries, numerical data stored in computers but undigested and untranslated, uncoordinated computer networks, decreasing journal subscriptions in the face of soaring costs, and the need to adapt scientific data for multidisciplinary audiences.

The report also makes a strong case for recognizing information as an emerging science in its own right, and along the way is not kind to Lee G. Burchinal, who heads the division of science information at the Foundation. It calls for an upgrading of information science at the Foundation and also for elimination of Burchinal's division.

"The proposed research program must be directed by an experienced and distinguished information scientist [who] commands the respect of the research community and who can play a major role in the organization and staffing of the new program. It must be placed within one of the major research directorates of the foundation where it can grow alongside the research programs of sister disciplines and receive the same management direction, peer review, and financial support."

The task force calls for an increase in the information science budget from the current $5 million to $11.4 million. It also recommends that NSF:

- Appoint a permanent outside advisory panel to advise the NSF Director on priorities and management in the program.
- Continue to develop techniques and approaches for the design, prototype development, field testing, and evaluation of techniques for dissemination and use of information.
- Give staff support for activities in national and international policies bearing on information science.
- Take charge of doing the important policy research and analysis of national issues related to information.
- Fund programs for training in the new information technologies.

The report of the Task Force on Science Information Activities is available without charge from Harvey Averech, directorate on Science, Technology, and International Affairs, National Science Foundation, 1800 G St. NW., Washington, DC 20550.

ENERGY *(Continued From Page 2)*

industry involvement. We have been heavy on cost sharing, not to save money as much as making sure industry puts its best talents on the projects. We are essentially subsidizing industry to accelerate what they would do alone anyway."

One innovation at the new department is an office of Small Scale Technology to "tap more fully the potential of individual inventors and small business firms." Whether the new office means anything more than a papier mache monument to the late E.F. Schumacher remains to be seen. The office comes under the assistant secretary for conservation and solar applications.

The high energy physics community has little to worry about beyond its chronic concerns over money for new equipment. OMB sources say the Office of Research will continue on as the field's sympathetic patron. As for the national laboratories, they can remain justified in feeling paranoid. Their funding will come from several elements in DOE, depending on projects, and they will undergo more and more scrutiny at the management level, as indicated by Schlesinger's response to a question at the briefing:

Q: Has a permanent decision been made vis-a-vis the centralized administration of the major national laboratory vis-a-vis the regional administration?

Schlesinger: If you mean by centralization that the laboratories will be reporting to an assistant secretary or possibly to the under secretary, the answer is yes, rather than to the operations office of ERDA or, before that, the AEC. If by centralization you mean that they all report to the same element of the Department of Energy, the answer is no . . . We are not planning that the laboratories be administered by regional administrators." This is a turnaround from ERDA plans.

China Announces Plans for Boosting Science

The most intriguing item of science-related news on the international scene is the September 22 announcement by the People's Republic of China (PRC) of intentions to unlimber that nation's vast scientific potential.

Though details are lacking, the immediate effect at the Washington end of things has been a burst of excitement over the likelihood that the moribund, tit-for-tat process of scientific exchanges in effect between the two countries for the past five years will now be succeeded by a boom in traffic. And right alongside the managers of exchange activities, US equipment manufacturers are eagerly viewing the prospects of widening Chinese markets for their wares.

To the extent that anything new is known of the projected renaissance of science in China, it is based on an official Chinese press agency report of a September 18 directive by the Central Committee, announcing that a national conference is to be held next spring for the purpose of rapidly fostering scientific and technological activity.

Against the background of Mao-era submergence of scientific activity, which included enforced anonymity even for outstanding researchers, the announcement notably emphasized that one purpose of the conference would be to bestow recognition on deserving scientists and engineers. And, with memories still fresh of scientists being required to join shovel brigades in the countryside, the Central Committee directive said that another purpose would be to increase the amount of time, money, and freedom available for China's scientists.

Pledging "four modernizations," the Central Committee specified ambitious goals for agriculture, industry, national defense, and science — but stressed that of the four, science merited the highest priority.

Furthermore, it highlighted the importance of "the principle of learning from abroad," stating that "In the natural sciences we are comparatively backward. We must strive to learn from other countries. It is necessary to improve the collection of scientific and technical information, promote international academic exchange and introduce necessary advanced techniques."

Implicit in the directive is abandonment of the Maoist aversion to anything that smacked of elitism. Thus, titles are to be restored for technical personnel, and scientific ability is to be measured through the traditional examination process, rather than by ideological fervor.

Prior to announcement of the Central Committee's directive, recent visiting American delegations obtained several hints of a shift in scientific policy in China. Thus, an American group, headed by Philip Handler president of the National Academy of Sciences, returned July 1 from a two-week visit to the PRC, and reported indications of coming change. Subsequently, the *China Exchange Newsletter,* published by the scholarly consortium that administers the US side of the exchange program, reported that "The delegation

(Continued on Page 5)

IEEE Delegation May Bring Back Word of New Chinese Policy

With the People's Republic of China recently announcing plans to build up its research establishment and expand scientific relations with other countries, attention focuses on a high-level American technical delegation that arrived in China September 27 for an 18-day visit.

Sponsored by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), and financed by the National Science Foundation, the 10-member group is making the tour at a time when the Carter Administration is wrestling with the issue of whether additional curbs should be placed on exports of US technology and knowhow that are potentially of strategic value. Included in the US delegation is Jordan Baruch, assistant secretary for science and technology in the Department of Commerce, which holds responsibility for the sensitive task of issuing export licenses for all US products going abroad.

According to an IEEE announcement, the object of the visit is to make a "broad assessment of all phases of communications"; discuss further exchanges with the host organization, the Chinese Electronics Society, and "To examine broader technological issues in the PRC, starting with a study of innovation and diffusion of new technology with particular reference to communications as an example."

In addition to Baruch, members of the delegation are:

Robert M. Saunders (chairman), IEEE president and professor of electrical engineering, University of California, Irvine
Paul E. Green Jr., IBM
Amos E. Joel Jr., Bell Laboratories
Ernest S. Kuh, University of California, Berkeley
Robert M. Lerner, Lincoln Laboratory, MIT
Walter E. Noller, ROLM Corporation
Herbert Sherman, Harvard School of Public Health
Baldwin L. Troutman Jr., Mitre institute
Gerd D. Wallenstein, consultant, formerly with GTE Lenkurt Corp.

High-Vacuum Oratory: Dr. Press's First Big Speech

Frank Press has given what his staff members describe as his "first big speech" since becoming the President's science adviser. But for those waiting for a signal about science-policy trends in the Carter Administration, the text is slim fare, containing little more than kind words about Press's boss and his hosts, high hopes for the future of science, and nary a clue about what's to come for the scientific community.

The speech, delivered September 21 at LaJolla, California, was on the occasion of the dedication of a couple of new buildings at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

After the customary opening pleasantries, Press said, "I've been told that there are many of you who are curious about how science and technology in general are faring these days in Washington" — and then he proceeded to tell them not very much.

"Perhaps most important," he said, "is that we have a President who is strongly aware of the important roles that science and technology play in a society — and the contributions they have made and can continue to make to the country.

"He understands science and technology not only as a former student and practitioner of them, but as a farmer and businessman who has personally witnessed very practical benefits from them. Because of this background, he is not intimidated by technical advice. And this is important these days when so many matters of national concern have technological roots and must be understood for the best decisions to be made."

Press continued: "On the basis of my discussions with him, I believe that the President's background and interest will be reflected in the Federal budgeting for research and development. This does not mean that R&D are automatically going to experience explosive growth. The overall Federal budget will remain tight. But it does mean that R&D will be wisely considered in the light of their needs and their potential contribution."

Press then listed a number of subjects that have been assigned to his office for study, and said that he would rely on his staff and outside consultants to do the work. He added that evidence of the Administration's interest in universities was to be seen in meetings he had arranged between university officials and the President, Vice President, and the Secretary of Energy. "I think these meetings have been very productive and useful to all concerned," he said — without one word about what was discussed.

(Continued on Page 6)

CHINA

(Continued From Page 4)

learned that the CAS (Chinese Academy of Sciences) is entering a new period of ascendency. A ministry-ranked institution, the CAS is now being assigned a major role in providing the scientific and technical expertise necessary to modernize agriculture, industry and national defense by the year 2000. The Academy's more than sixty research institutes, formerly under attack for their 'elitism,' are now receiving encouragement and support from central and local authorities."

The *Exchange* newsletter also reported that "Social science research may also be given greater emphasis following a period of criticism during the Cultural Revolution. A new Chinese Academy of Social Sciences has just been established which will incorporate the research institutes representing economics, linguistics, history, archaeology, geography, and philosophy. . ."

The announced shift in Chinese policy comes at a time when American officials have been expressing a good deal of dissatisfaction with the progress of the exchange program. For the first several years, they patiently accepted the slow pace and limited scope of the program. But lately, with exchanges still limited to evenly balanced groups, and never more than a dozen groups going in any one year, US officials have been muttering that the program amounts to little more than "scholarly tourism." Furthermore, they have regularly complained that the Chinese have been highly restrictive in regard to where Americans can go and what they can study. Since Chinese scientific research is relatively backward, the restrictions have created little furor among American scientists. But Chinese social science, and China as an object of interest to social scientists, is another matter. American social scientists are keen to be turned loose on China; but they're the ones who have had the greatest difficulty in getting admitted. Whether that will now change is another one of many eastern mysteries.

If the Chinese do want to establish close scientific links with the US, they will find themselves the beneficiaries of a bit of luck in high places. Presidential Science Adviser Frank Press was, until joining the White House staff last spring, chairman of the Committee on Scholarly Communications with the People's Republic of China — which administers the exchange program for the US. The staff director of the Committee, Anne Keatley, is on Press's staff, with responsibilities for international scientific affairs.

If the Chinese want to more ahead quickly, they will find friends in high places who are eager to cooperate with them.

Study Urges Disclosure on Industrial Carcinogens

In a report that is likely to draw the wrath of industry, a National Academy of Sciences (NAS) committee urges the federal government to require the use of loud and clear methods to advise workers of carcinogenic hazards in their places of employment.

Interestingly, the committee, numbering 10 members, drawn mainly from academe, contained no one from industry or labor, which often team up to keep plants in operation, regardless of health hazards. The omissions, which provide a rare instance of the Academy stacking a committee in favor of the public interest, were lamely explained in the report as follows:

"The inclusion of representatives of labor, management, and government in the membership was considered; but it was concluded that the objectivity of the Committee would be better maintained if it were not established on any such representational basis."

Since each of the Academy's innumerable committees is handpicked for its particular task, this peculiar means of attaining objectivity is not likely to become a precedent. But in the Academy's evolution away from being a tool of the status quo, this choplogic approach for eluding industrial influence is worthy of note.

Prepared by the Committee on Public Information in the Prevention of Occupational Cancer, under the chairmanship of Charles R. Shaw, professor of biology at the University of Texas, the report states:

"There are some who believe that a full disclosure and continuing emphasis of the hazard of a carcinogen in the workplace may provoke a state of anxiety in some workers that is detrimental to their productivity and to their well-being. There is no question that the term 'cancer' has a frightening connotation. Nevertheless, information essential to the understanding of risk by the whole group of employees should not be withheld on the chance that it might arouse anxiety in some."

The Shaw committee, working under a contract from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, took issue with the argument that occupational exposure accounts for only a relatively small portion of cancer cases. "Although only five per cent have been attributed directly to occupational exposures," it states, "this may be an underestimate in view of the difficulty of identifying causes. Regardless of the proportion, however," it continued, "occupational carcinogens constitute a group of environmental factors that, when identified, are subject to specific regulation and engineering controls, which offers the possibility of nearly total prevention of new cases."

Though the report makes no specific accusations, it strongly implies that at least some industries have been minimally attentive to informing their workers about cancer hazards on the job.

"Early in its deliberations," the report states, "the Committee agreed that there is a fundamental ethical principle that may best be called the 'right to know.' We believe that the readiness with which we accepted this principle parallels the increasing concern of society as a whole with the individual's right to self-determination.

"The Committee believes it unethical and unrealistic to assume that the right to know requires employers to

(Continued on Page 7)

PRESS

(Continued From Page 5)

Then he told his oceanographic audience that the oceans have "enormous implications for science and technology policy" and that there will be "increasing demands on the ocean sciences."

Oceans, he informed his audience, are involved in a variety of environmental problems, and "During the coming year, we will be examining the possibility of a new national oceans policy that we hope will establish new ways of dealing with this complex environmental challenge."

"With all that I have touched on today," he went on, ". . . it hardly seems necessary for me to offer any assurances that the work in your fields, and at important centers of research such as Scripps, will receive the Federal support it deserves."

But, having ventured out on a limb, he promptly retreated: "No doubt we will witness some shifting priorities. No doubt there will be some stringencies and competition for support, as there is a limit to our resources and an abundance of problems to face. But, broadly speaking the future for oceans research will remain bright. . . We, with our borders on two great oceans and an interest in all the waters of the world, are still a frontier nation. And I believe that in spirit, we have a frontier administration."

The speech was the first of at least a dozen that Press, now settled into his job, has agreed to give over the next several months.

As a soporific, it was fine — meeting all FDA requirements for safety and efficacy. But if the science adviser wants to do more than induce drowsiness in his audiences, he might venture into saying something substantive. There is no shortage of topics. For example, academic audiences would like to know the state of Administration deliberations on the job shortage for newly graduated scientists; the widening gap — induced by federal granting policies — between first and lesser-ranked research institutions; the reorganization outlook for federal agencies, and so forth.

. . . Says that All Cancer Risks "Must be Unmasked"

(Continued From Page 6)

inform workers about only the few chemicals that nearly everyone agrees are human carcinogens. It also believes it unethical and unrealistic to argue that the right to know requires employers merely to make summary information about the exposure of workers to suspected carcinogens *available for inspection* (original italics). Therefore, the Committee finds it necessary for government agencies and employers to make a reasonable effort to ensure that workers *comprehend* the relevant information. They should devote appropriate time and resources to gathering, interpreting, and explaining that information.

"The Committee suggests that the employee's right of self-determination shapes the boundries of the employer's duty to reveal information. The employee must possess enough information to enable an intelligent choice. Thus, the ethical test for whether particular information must be divulged is its relevance to the employee's decision. All risk potentially affecting the decision must be unmasked."

In calling for unmasking *all* risks, the Committee was taking another position that is sure to infuriate industry, for the report also states:

"Although there is still some debate within scientific circles, for all practical purposes there is no dose of a carcinogen below which one can say there is absolutely no risk of its causing cancer."

Specifically, the report calls for providing workers and job applicants with the following "once it has been determined reliably that a substance is or may be carcinogenic":

- The identification of the substance in question by the name used in the workplace and, where possible, by its generic name.
- Data on the carcinogenicity of the substance, including evidence from human epidemiologic studies, animal studies, and other valid techniques.
- An interpretation of the risks in the workplace implied by the above data.
- A description of the disease in man, where applicable.
- The route of exposure within the workplace.
- Required and recommended measures to reduce exposure, including containment and disposal measures, monitoring procedures, and individual protective measures.

In a recommendation that implies less than full faith in industry and government as sources of information for the worker, the report states that "Sources beyond those charged with statutory responsibility should also be involved in informing him. Consideration should be given to labor unions, extension services of landgrant colleges and other adult-education activities; state, county, and municipal health departments; and community-oriented public-service health groups."

And it suggested that "The information program should be initiated at the pre-employment interview and should be presented recurrently under a variety of circumstances, regardless of the stability of the work force."

In addition to Chairman Shaw, the members of the Committee are:

Anna M. Baetjer, Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health

Erwin B. Bettinghaus, dean, College of Communication Arts and Sciences, Michigan State University

Paul A. Brodeur Jr., *New Yorker* Magazine

W. Clark Cooper, Equitable Environmental Health, Inc., Berkeley, Calif.

Paul B. Cornely, professor emeritus, Howard University College of Medicine

Brenda L. Dervin, assistant professor of communications, University of Washington

Abraham M. Lilienfeld, Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health

Philip R. Reilly, Yale Law School

Paul E. White, Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health.

(Copies of the report, *Informing Workers and Employers about Occupational Cancer,* are available, $4.00 paper, $3.00 microfiche, from the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA. 22161. Specify PB 269 559).

Arms Control Appointments

William H. Kincade, staff director of the Joint Congressional Committee on Defense Production, has been appointed executive director of the Arms Control Association, an influential, Washington-based organization that has been heavily raided by the Carter Administration for arms control specialists.

Kincade succeeds Thomas A. Halsted, who has become public affairs adviser for the Arms Control and Disarmement Agency (ACDA). Earlier, four of the Association's board members took positions with the Administration: Anne H. Cahn, formerly with the Harvard Program for Science and International Affairs, who joined ACDA, as did Lawrence D. Weiler, formerly of Stanford University; Adrian S. Fisher, former dean of the Georgetown University Law School, who became ambassador to the Committee of the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva; and Gerard C. Smith, former ACDA director, who was appointed special representative for non-proliferation matters and US representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency , Vienna.

News Notes: White House Info Study; Science & Art

The White House has appointed an advisory committee to study the application of information technology to decisionmaking in the Executive Office of the President.

Presidential Science Adviser Frank Press was a key figure in formulating the study and one of his aides in the Office of Scienc and Technology Policy, Joel Snow, is serving as executive secretary of the committee, which is scheduled to report by the end of November.

The committee itself is headed by Donald Gosden, vice president for computer services for Equitable Life Insurance Corp. The other members are John Turner, professor of computer science, Columbia University; William Cotterman, professor of computer science, Georgia State University; Gerald Dineen, assistant Defense secretary for communications, command, control, and intelligence and formerly director of the Lincoln Laboratories in Cambridge, Mass.; Vincent MacRae of the IBM Federal Systems Division, and Russell Shank, director of libraries at the University of California, Los Angeles.

Snow says the aim of the committee is to advise the White House on using information technology to aid in decisionmaking. "In the case of security issues," says Snow, "there is an automatic tracking system that keeps the President informed on the status of important papers. There is no such analogue for domestic policy issues. We're looking, for example, into the feasibility of linking up with the Library of Congress information system."

●

An attempt to bring scientists, engineers, and artists together to perform some joint research is being started at the Washington Project for the Arts (WPA) in Washington, DC.

WPA, supported by the National Endowment for the Arts, is establishing an Electronic Arts Studio, directed by Washington artist Reginald Pollack. The object is to adapt technological devices and techniques such as lasers, computers, holographic equipment, color xerography, and a variety of materials as artistic tools to explore relationships between science and the arts. Pollack says the aims at the momemt are open ended, depending on the knowhow and equipment the participants bring to the effort.

Serving on the board of the studio, besides Pollack, is Rustum Roy, a member of the National Academy of Sciences and director of the materials research laboratory at Pennsylvania State University; Mike Noll, a former staffer at the old White House Office of Science and Technology and currently a computer and telecommunications researcher at AT&T, and Hugh Miller, executive director of the foreign secretary's office, National Academy of Engineering.

The group sees the project as an attempt to cut through some of the traditional academic funding procedures that conspire against collaboration between artists and scientists. Pollack says he hopes the project will interest artistically bent engineers ready to lend equipment and take part in various projects.

The project will officially open with a show October 4 consisting of a laser mobile, some digital computer representations of classical works of art, color xerographic reproductions, and images made by lasers. Pollack says the show is the beginning of an effort that will need the participation of technical people.

WPA is directed by Alice Denny, a prominent booster of the arts in Washington and its phone number is (202) 347-8304. A parallel attempt to bridge the arts and medical therapeutics is being started at the Greater Reston Arts Center in Reston, Va., directed by Judy Forst (703) 471-9242.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

-00006 99/99
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS
300 N ZEEB RD
ANN ARBOR MI 48106